

REMARKS

The application previously included claims 1-6, 8, 10-18, 20 and 25-31. In the Office Action of June 13, 2011, all pending claims are rejected. With this paper, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 20, 25-27 and 30-31 are amended, no new claims are added, and claims 3, 10, 12-13, 15, 17 and 28-29 are cancelled. No new matter has been introduced with the amendment. Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 20, 25-27 and 30-31 are now pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-18, 20 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverinen et al. (US PG PUB 2004/0064741 A1, Haverinen hereinafter) in view of Ahmavaara et al. (US PG PUB 2004/0066756 A1, Ahmavaara hereinafter).

In the rejected claims, claims 1, 30 and 31 are independent. Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections.

With this paper, claim 1 is amended. The newly amended claim 1 is directed to a method for a user equipment (UE) to select a mobile communication network to access through a Wireless Local Area Network (WLAN) access network (AN), wherein the mobile communication network is a different network from the WLAN AN. The method comprises, *inter alia*, the following features:

sending, by the UE, an authentication request message to a second access point (AP) of the WLAN AN after a connection between the UE and the WLAN AN has been established;

receiving, by the UE, a User Identity Request message from the second AP;
obtaining, by the UE, information of the second AP that identifies the second AP;

determining, by the UE, whether the information of the second AP matches information of a first AP of the WLAN AN stored in the UE, wherein if the UE previously successfully accessed a first mobile communication network through the first AP, information of the first AP and information of the first mobile communication network are stored in the UE;

if the information of the second AP matches the information of the first AP stored in the UE, returning, by the UE, a first User Identity Response message to said

second AP, wherein the first User Identity response message carries the stored information of the first mobile communication network;

wherein the information of the first mobile communication network carried in the first User Identity response message is used by the second AP to forward the authentication request message to the first mobile communication network.

(Emphasis added)

Haverinen is directed to a method in a system for transferring accounting information. Haverinen discloses that: “The EAP service authorization server ... see FIGS. 4 and 5, ...sending a Diameter EAP-answer, message 606, to the access point. The Diameter EAP-answer includes an EAP-request/Service-Authorization that carries accounting information... is sent as any other EAP-request to said specific terminal, message 608...” (see paragraph [0094]) and “In the terminal the accounting information is verified 706. If the verification is successful then the accounting information is signed and the terminal sends an EAPOL message 708 including an EAP-Response/Service-Authorization, which is carrying the signed accounting information, to the access point ...Then the access point/EAP service authorization server generates and sends a Diameter Accounting-Request 714 to the AAA server.” (see paragraph [0095]), and “In one embodiment the access point 12 is part of an access network that is managed by an access network operator and the AAA-server is part of an accounting management system managed by an AAA-server operator or an home operator...” (see paragraph [0066]). That is to say, there is no information of a mobile communication network, which the terminal successfully accessed through the access point previously, in the EAPOL message 708. And there is no disclosure in Haverinen, that the AAA-server belongs to a network different from the WLAN. Thus, the access point forwards the accounting message to a predefined AAA server in the system without referring to information such as information of a mobile communication network provided by the terminal.

Different from what is disclosed in Haverinen, in claim 1 of the present application, if the UE previously successfully accessed a first mobile communication network through the first AP, information of the first AP and information of the first mobile communication network are stored in the UE. And, if it is determined by the UE that the information of the second AP matches the information of the first AP, information of the first mobile communication network stored in the UE is sent to the second AP. The second AP then forwards the authentication request message to the first mobile communication network

according to the information of the first mobile communication network, which is the mobile communication network UE previously successfully accessed through the first AP.

In addition, from above disclosure of Haverinen, the “information of EAP service authorization server” cited in the line 9, page 3 of the office action is indeed the accounting information.

And the accounting information in Haverinen is defined as “... a value indicating for how long a user has utilized a specific service, a value indicating the amount of data received from and/or sent to a specific service, information regarding when the user utilized the service, and/or the number of and/or the type of transactions performed” (see paragraph [0003]). That is to say, in Haverinen, accounting information is information related to services a user has utilized, not the information of an access point, through which the UE successful accessed a communication network previously.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that the information of the WLAN serving the UE matches the information of EAP service authorization server (page 3 of the Office Action). In response, the Applicant has amended claims to specify that the “information of the WLAN” is information of a second access point (AP) which identifies the second AP. Thus, the feature “determining, by the UE, whether the information of the second AP matches information of a first AP of the WLAN AN stored in the UE” is totally different from the “verifying accounting information” in Haverinen.

Further, as acknowledged by the Office, Haverinen does not explicitly disclose the information stored in the UE (page 4 of the Office Action).

Therefore, Haverinen does not disclose the feature “determining, by the UE, whether the information of the second AP matches information of a first AP of the WLAN AN stored in the UE, wherein if the UE previously successfully accessed a first mobile communication network through the first AP, information of the first AP and information of the first mobile communication network is stored in the UE; if the information of the second AP matches the information of the first AP stored in the UE, returning, by the UE, a first User Identity Response message to said second AP, wherein the first User Identity response message carries the stored information of the first mobile communication network; wherein the information of the first mobile communication network carried in the first User Identity response message is used by the second AP to forwards the authentication request message to the first mobile communication network”.

Ahmavaara is directed to network selection in a WLAN. Ahmavaara states that “user equipment resident in the wireless access network ...the identification of the at least one other network is stored in the user equipment... The identification of the at least one other network may be transmitted from the wireless access network to the user equipment prior to storage therein.” (see paragraph [0019]). That is to say, in Ahmavaara, the identification of the at least one other network is provided by the wireless access network currently serving the user equipment. And, for the identification is not verified as valid for the user equipment successfully accesing the at least one other network before storing, the "at least one other network" identified by the identification is not necessarily the same network the UE successfully accessed through the wireless access network previously.

Different from Ahmavaara, in claim 1, the information of the first AP and information of a first mobile communication network is stored by the UE, if the UE successfully accesses the first mobile communication network through the first AP previously. That means, information of a first mobile communication network is stored during a previous accessing. And, before storing, the network selection information is verified as valid in a previous accessing.

Ahmavaara also fails to disclose the feature: “determining, by the UE, whether the information of the second AP matches information of a first AP of the WLAN AN stored in the UE; if the information of the second AP matches the information of the first AP stored in the UE, returning, by the UE, a first User Identity Response message to said second AP, wherein the first User Identity response message carries the stored information of the first mobile communication network; wherein the information of the first mobile communication network carried in the first User Identity response message is used by the second AP to forwards the authentication request message to the first mobile communication network”.

Neither Haverinen nor Ahmavaara discloses the above discussed distinguishing features.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that, for at least for the foregoing reasons, a combination of Haverinen and Ahmavaara does not discloses each and every feature of the amended claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4-5, 6, 8, 11, 14, 16, 20 and 25-27 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason of their dependencies from an allowable independent claim as well as for the additional

limitations.

Claim 30 recites a system for selecting a mobile communication network to access in a WLAN interworking network according to claim 1, and is amended to include similar distinguishing features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 30 is patentable.

Claim 31 recites a UE for selecting a mobile communication network to access in a WLAN interworking network according to claim 1, and is amended to include similar distinguishing features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 31 is patentable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejections have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the email address or telephone numbers indicated below.

A petition for two-month time extension and an amount of fees required are submitted herewith. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any unpaid fees deemed required in connection with this submission or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **50-4983**.

Respectfully submitted,

November 14, 2011
Dated: _____

/Shiming Wu/
By: _____
Shiming Wu
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 56,885

Customer No. 97291
Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.
IPR Dept.
Building B1-3-A
Huawei Industrial Base
Bantian, Shenzhen 518129, CHINA

Direct Dial: +86-755-28789664
Voicemail: (631) 365-4632 (US number)
Fax: +86-755-28787222
Email: shiming.wu@huawei.com